Reply to Office Action of 15 April 2004

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, the pending independent claims, claims 21 and 31, were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 11, and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,809. And, as dependent claims 22-30 and 32-37 are dependent upon claims 21 and 31, respectively, objection was further made to these claims.

In response to the double patenting rejection, enclosed herewith, under separate title, is a terminal disclaimer, disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent issuing upon the present application.

While independent claims 21 and 31 have been amended, as set forth herein, such amendments are not believed to affect their scope. And, amendments made to dependent claims 22 and 29 are made merely responsive to the amendments made to their parent claim.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 21 and 31, and the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Allowance of the application is, accordingly, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 33,922

Dated: 21 June 04

.

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P. 5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400

Dallas, Texas 75225 Telephone: (214) 706-4200

Fax: (214) 706-4242

robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com

6